

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

BIENVENIDO LUGO-MARCHANT,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	CIVIL ACTION
v.)	NO. 05-11317-NMG
)	
PETER TSICKRITZIS,)	
KEVIN KINGSTON, and)	
UNITED LIQUORS LIMITED,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS

This matter is before the court on the following four motions, among others:

(1) “Plaintiff’s Motion in Limine” (Docket No. 54); (2) “Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Defendants to Produce Complete and Substantive Responses to the Interrogatories Propounded by the Plaintiff” (Docket No. 55); (3) “Plaintiff’s Motion to Allow duces tecum on Public Records and Others Records Not Released by the Defendants” (Docket No. 56); and (4) “Defendants’ Motion for a Protective Order Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)” (Docket No. 57). On April 26, 2007, this court held a hearing on the motions at which the plaintiff appeared pro se. After reviewing the parties’ submissions and considering the parties’ oral arguments, this court hereby ORDERS as follows:

1. The plaintiff’s motion in limine pertaining to the production of the plaintiff’s medical records (Docket No. 54) is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. If the defendants decide to pursue discovery of the plaintiff’s medical records at a later date, the

defendants will file a motion to compel the production of such records, and the plaintiff's issues will be addressed in that context.

2. The plaintiff's motion to compel supplemental responses to interrogatories (Docket No. 55) is DENIED to the extent that it seeks information pertaining to the individual defendants' medical conditions and records. Such information is not relevant to the claims and defenses at issue in this case. The motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to the extent that it seeks supplemental responses regarding the individual defendants' financial information. The plaintiff may renew his request for this information if the individual defendants remain in the case following the court's decision on the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

3. The motion for an order pertaining to public records (Docket No. 56) is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to renewal if the individual defendants remain in the case following the court's decision on the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

4. The defendants' motion for a protective order precluding the plaintiff from proceeding with his effort to obtain documents from 19 different third parties (Docket No. 57) is ALLOWED.

5. The remaining motions which were argued on this date were taken under advisement.

DATED: April 26, 2007

/ s / Judith Gail Dein
Judith Gail Dein
United States Magistrate Judge